



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,106	01/19/2001	Toshikazu Ito	00247CONT	5351

23338 7590 11/07/2003

DENNISON, SCHULTZ & DOUGHERTY
1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

LEE, EDMUND H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/764,106

Examiner

EDMUND H. LEE

Applicant(s)

ITO ET AL.

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12, 15, 16, 21, and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10, 13, 14, 17-20 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "corresponds an outer cross section of the frame" (cl 26, ln 7) is confusing because it is idiomatically incorrect.

Correction is required.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8-10, 13-14, 17-20, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujino et al (USPN 5362428) in view of Suita et al (USPN 5183612). In regard to claim 8, Tsujino et al teach the basic claimed process including manufacturing a panel unit having a curved panel and a directly extruded molding (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); extruding a resin molding material directly onto a peripheral edge of the curved panel (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); and while extruding the molding material, tilting the peripheral edge of the curved panel in response to movement of the curved panel relative to the extrusion port in order to maintain a constant angle between the peripheral edge of the curved panel and the

Art Unit: 1732

extrusion port (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10). However, Tsujino et al do not teach moving a peripheral edge of the curved panel relative to an extrusion port. Suita et al teach extruding a molding material onto a panel while the panel moves relative to an extrusion port (fig 5). Tsujino et al and Suita et al are combinable because they are analogous with respect to extrusion molding a molding material onto a peripheral edge of a panel. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to move the panel of Tsujino et al as taught by Suita et al in order to reduce the complexity of the molding process. In regard to claims 9-10, 13-14, 17-20, and 23-25, such are taught by Tsujino et al as evident by col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; and figs 1-10.

4. Claim 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujino et al (USPN 5362428) in view of Suita et al (USPN 5183612). In regard to claim 26, Tsujino et al teach the basic claimed process including manufacturing a panel unit including a curved window glass panel and a frame mounted on a peripheral edge of the window glass panel (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); providing a molding die having an extrusion port for extruding a molding material to form the frame wherein the port has an inner circumference surface that corresponds to an outer cross section of the frame (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); disposing the peripheral edge of the curved window glass panel proximally with respect to the extrusion port in order to form a molding space defined by the peripheral edge of the curved window glass panel and

Art Unit: 1732

the inner circumferential surface of the extrusion port, wherein the molding space corresponds to the cross section of the frame (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); extruding the molding material into the molding space (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); controllably tilting the curved window glass panel relative to the molding die such that the peripheral edge of the curved window glass panel maintains a constant angle relative to the molding die (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10); and extruding a resin molding material directly onto a peripheral edge of the curved panel (col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; figs 1-10). However, Tsujino et al do not teach moving a peripheral edge of the curved panel relative to an extrusion port. Suita et al teach extruding a molding material onto a panel while the panel moves relative to an extrusion port (fig 5). Tsujino et al and Suita et al are combinable because they are analogous with respect to extrusion molding a molding material onto a peripheral edge of a panel. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to move the panel of Tsujino et al as taught by Suita et al in order to reduce the complexity of the molding process. In regard to claim 27, such is taught by Tsujino et al as evident by col 3, ln 61-col 4, ln 2; col 5, lns 37-51; col 6, lns 41-54; col 8, lns 3-34; and figs 1-10.

5. Claims 11,12,15,16,21, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Art Unit: 1732

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cornils et al (USPN 5645785) teach extrusion molding an edging on a panel wherein the angle of the panel edge is maintained relative to the extrusion die.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDMUND H. LEE whose telephone number is 703.305.4019. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY FROM 9AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on 703.305.5493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703.872.9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.0661.


EDMUND H. LEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732 11/5/03

EHL